

## **REMARKS:**

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are amended, and claim 4 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering each and every rejection against claim 4 moot.

Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims and the specification, *inter alia*, at least in paragraph [0008] of the application as published. Therefore, no new matter is added.

### **Rejections under 35 USC §112-1<sup>st</sup> paragraph**

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC §112-1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

Claim 5 is amended to recite that “when the base station, which the channel processing of the uplink wireless signals relates to, comprises both of the first base station and the second base station”. Claim 5, as amended, can find its support, *inter alia*, at least in Fig. 7-9 and related paragraph in specification. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been traversed.

### **Rejections under 35 USC §112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph**

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC §112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. As detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that the newly added amendments to, at least, claims 1 and 9 have rendered this rejection moot.

### **Rejections under 35 USC §102**

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Menon et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,694, hereinafter “Menon et al.”. The Applicants respectfully submits that the newly added amendments to, at least, claim 1 have rendered this rejection moot.

Specifically, Claim 1 now recites that “the first base station is a local base station from a centralized base station system, and the second base station is a remote end base station from another remote end base station system”. The Applicants respectfully submit that Menon et al. does not disclose at least this claim element.

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action acknowledged that Menon et al. discloses “*said wireless base station system comprising a first base station (Fig. 8C-element 804b-IBS-G2), a second base station (Fig. 8C-element 804a-IBS-G1) and a wireless networks control device (Fig. 8C-element 815-MSC), wherein the first base station and the second base station are able to jointly share channel processing task of a cell of the first base station*”. Office Action at 5.

While the Applicants respectfully disagree that there is a correspondence between the Applicants’ claimed “first base station” and Menon et al.’s Fig. 8C-element 804b, and the Applicants’ claimed “second base station” and Menon et al.’s Fig. 8C-element 804a, the now amended claim 1 clearly requires that the “first base station” to be “a local base station” and the “second base station” to be a “remote end base station”. Claim 1 now further requires that the “first base station” to be from a “centralized base station system” and the “second base station” to be from “another remote end base station system”. In contrast, Menon et al. does not disclose or teach these technical features.

In contrast, in col. 20 line 65 to col. 21 line 3 and Fig. 8C, Menon et al. discloses an example of handoff procedures in wireless local loop subsystem 540 illustrated in Fig. 5. From Fig. 5 and the related description in col. 20 lines 31-33, it can be seen that Menon et al. discloses that one or more intelligent base stations 504 are **centralized** within wireless local loop subsystem 540. Hence, Menon et al. does not disclose and, in fact, teaches away from having “another remote end base station system” of the “second remote end base station” in addition to the “centralized base station system” of the “first base station.” Moreover, Menon et al. discloses, in col. 21 line 57-64 that, that there is a **physical** connection between its intelligent base stations 804a and 804b, which is **opposite** of the Applicants’ claimed invention that requires “*the first base station is a local base station from a centralized base station system, and the second base station is a remote end base station from another remote end base station system”.*

In addition, the Applicants’ claimed invention requires “*the first base station and the second base station are able to jointly share channel processing task of a cell of the first base station*”, in contrast, Menon et al. discloses that its “intelligent base stations” 804b and 804a do **not** share a task. For example, as disclosed in col. 22, lines 3-11, Menon et al.’ first

“intelligence base station” 804a becomes the **anchor** base station, the second “intelligence base station” 804b becomes a **relay** base station, and that the anchor “intelligence base” station 804a does **not** relinquish control of a call, and therefore, Menon et al. discloses and teaches that the roles played by the **anchor** base station and the **relay** base station are obviously different and no joint sharing of a task occurs.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Menon et al.

Claim 3, which depends on claim 1 is also not anticipated by Menon et al at least by virtue of its dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC §102 is respectfully overcome.

### **Rejections under 35 USC §103**

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Menon et al. in view of Semper, Pub. No. US20030119507A1; claims 5-6 and 8-9 over Menon et al. in view of Takao et al., Pub. No. US20020160777A1, and claim 7 over Menon et al., in view of Takao et al. (and Kusaki et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6108546A). While **not** necessarily agreeing with the Office Action in the Office Action’s analysis of these claims and the above references in view of applicable rules and regulations, to expedite the prosecution, the Applicants simply submit that since each of claims 2 and 5-9 depends (directly or indirectly) from claim 1, claims 2 and 5-9 are patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as the independent claim 1 from which each of them depends.

Additionally, it is noted that, as detailed above, this Amendment is fully supported by the originally filed application and thus, no new matter has been added. For this reason, the Amendment should be entered.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action has been overcome and that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants' attorney respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-3 and 5-9. If such action cannot be taken, however, the Examiner is cordially invited to place a telephone call to Applicant's attorney to resolve any outstanding issue without the issuance of a further Office Action.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Dated: February 7, 2011

By: /Lennie A. Bersh/  
Lennie A. Bersh  
Registration No. 55,000

Mailing Address:  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
MetLife Building  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
Telephone: (212) 801-9200  
Facsimile: (212) 801-6400